

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 3, 2006 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. No new matter is added. Claims 1-16 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,596,641 to Ohashi et al. (Ohashi). Applicants respectfully submit that Ohashi fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in any of the pending claims.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-8 depend, is directed to a security association establishment negotiation method. Identifying information and a request for a security association are forwarded from a Mobile Node via a first interface to a first network element. The identifying information and the request for a security association is forwarded from the first network element to a second network element via a second interface. Negotiations are performed between the first network element and the second network element via the second interface to establish a security association between the Mobile Node and the first network element. The second network element utilizes previously stored security association parameters of the Mobile Node. Upon agreement between the first network element and the second network element with regard to the

security association parameters, the first network element forwards the agreed-upon security association parameters negotiated between the first network element and the second network element to the Mobile Node via the first interface.

Claim 9, from which claims 10-16 depend, is directed to a security association establishment negotiation apparatus for a Mobile Node. A first interface is connected to a first network element to forward identifying information and the request for a Security Association from the Mobile Node to the first network element. A second interface is connected between the first network element and a second network element to forward the identifying information and the request for a Security Association from the first network element to the second network element. The first network element performs negotiations between the first network element and the second network element to establish a Security Association between the Mobile Node and the first network element utilizing Security Association parameters of the Mobile Node previously stored in the second network element. Upon agreement between the first network element and the second network element with regard to the Security Association parameters, the first network element forwards the agreed-upon Security Association parameters negotiated between the first network element and the second network element to the Mobile Node via the first interface.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in Ohashi.

Ohashi is directed to an authentication method for mobile communications. In Ohashi, the mobile station is authenticated by sending from the home network 30 (alleged second network element in the Office Action) to the roamed network 31 (alleged first network element in the Office Action), a plurality of pairs of first random numbers and calculation results of the cipher function (alleged security associations in the Office Action). The mobile station is authenticated by using a pair of second random numbers and the calculation result with respect to the second random number sent from the mobile station.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ohashi fails to disclose or suggest the features of forwarding identifying information and a request for a security association from a Mobile Node via a first interface to a first network element, and forwarding the identifying information and the request for a security association from the first network element to a second network element via a second interface, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 9. The Office Action appears to construe the phrase “network element” very broadly, such that a network element is an entire network (30 and 31 in Ohashi). However, the distinctions between a network element (i.e. an element within a network) and an entire network as disclosed in Ohashi, are well known in the art.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Ohashi fails to disclose or suggest “upon agreement between the first network element and the second network element with regard to the security association parameters, the first network element forwarding the agreed-upon security association parameters negotiated between the first network

element and the second network element to the Mobile Node via the first interface” as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 9. Ohashi merely discloses that the roamed network (alleged first network element in the Office Action) generates a set of random numbers and then produces extended random numbers that are sent to the home network. (See Ohashi at column 11 lines 1-7). Thus, in Ohashi, the alleged security parameters are not negotiated between the first and second networks and, these alleged security parameters eventually passed to the mobile station.

Applicants respectfully submit that because claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 depend from claims 1 and 9, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 9, as well as for the additional features recited in these dependent claims.

Based at least on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Ohashi fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1-3 and 9-11. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 4-8 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ohashi in view of US Patent No. 6, 915, 345 to Tummala (Tummala). The Office Action took the position that Ohashi disclosed all of the features of these claims except the feature of a network element connected to a first gateway which is allegedly disclosed by Tummala. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in any

of the pending claims. Specifically, Ohashi is deficient at least for the reasons discussed above, and Tummala fails to cure these deficiencies.

Tummala is directed to an IP based mobile communications system, in which the Mobile Node changes its point of attachment to the network while maintaining network connectivity. This is accomplished in part by allowing an AAA Broker Server to maintain client information necessary to establish the secure Mobile Node connection to the home network. The Office Action relies on Tummala to disclose the feature of a network element connected to a first gateway. However, Tummala fails to disclose or suggest the features of forwarding identifying information and a request for a security association from a Mobile Node via a first interface to a first network element, and forwarding the identifying information and the request for a security association from the first network element to a second network element via a second interface. Further, Tummala fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of “upon agreement between the first network element and the second network element with regard to the security association parameters, the first network element forwarding the agreed-upon security association parameters negotiated between the first network element and the second network element to the Mobile Node via the first interface.” Thus, Tummala fails to cure the deficiencies of Ohashi.

Based at least on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 4-8 and 12-16.


Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-8 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-16 recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in any of the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that each of claims 1-16 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Brown
Registration No. 51,091

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:jkm

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time
Check No. 14985